



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/639,610	08/12/2003	Eileen Cecilia Schwab	8285/630	5403
7590 12/02/2004				
William A. Webb BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60610			EXAMINER HOOSAIN, ALLAN	
			ART UNIT 2645	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/639,610	Applicant(s) SCHWAB ET AL.	
	Examiner Allan Hoosain	Art Unit 2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-3 and 8 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-3 of U. S. 6,631,182 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

Art Unit: 2645

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

US 6,631,182, recites limitations which are substantially the same and broader in scope as recited in the claims of the instant Application. For example, US 6,631,182, Claim 1, recites "receiving a call at a first end office switch of the telecommunications system, the call placed by a calling party for a called party at a called communication station". The instant application, claim 1, recites "receiving a call placed by a calling party for a called party at a called communication station".

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 4 recites the limitation "the platform" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-2,4,6,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Frech et al.** (US 6,233,325) in view of Blakely (US 5,007,076).

As to Claims 1-2,4,6,8, with respect to Figures 2-7, **Frech** teaches a call processing method in a telecommunications system, the method comprising:

receiving a call placed by a calling party for a called party at a called communication station (Figure 2, label 1);

retrieving a subscriber profile for the called party (Figure 2, labels 4-5);

Art Unit: 2645

playing to the calling party one of a called party-provided greeting and a greeting announcement (Figure 6, label 31);

if a recorded name screening feature is active, prompting the calling party for identification (Figure 6, label 32), and

recording the spoken identification provided by the calling party (Figure 6, label 32);

if the called party is engaged in a call, providing an announcement and entering a call waiting process (Col. 7, lines 50-58);

otherwise, routing the call to a directory number in accordance with the subscriber profile (Figure 6, label 34);

playing to the called communication station one of a predefined announcement and the recorded spoken identification (Figure 6, label 42);

determining from the subscriber profile if caller ID screening is active for the called party (Col. 4, lines 20-35);

if so, determining if a calling directory number is available for the call (Col. 4, lines 20-35);

if so, providing the calling party directory number to the called communication station (Col. 4, lines 20-35);

otherwise, if the calling directory number is not unknown, announcing an unavailable directory number to the called communication station (Col. 6, lines 15-20, Col. 7, lines 10-15, 23-28);

prompting the called party to enter a call routing option (Col. 6, lines 55-58);

detecting a call routing option entered at the called communication station (Col. 6, lines 63-65);

Art Unit: 2645

if the entered call routing option corresponds to rejecting the call, routing the call to a reject-call default destination (Col. 7, lines 54-58); and

if the entered call routing option corresponds to accepting the call, connecting the call between the calling party with the called party (figure 5, label 27);

Frech does not teach the following limitations:

“providing the calling party directory number to the called communication station”,
“announcing an unavailable directory number to the called communication station” and “routing the call to a reject-call default destination”

However, it is obvious that **Frech** suggests the limitations. This is because **Frech** teaches calling party identification services (Col. 2, lines 14-24). **Blakely** teaches the limitations (Col. 6, lines 35-43, 54-59). Having the cited analogous art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the limitations to **Frech**'s invention for call announcement as taught by **Blakely**'s invention in order to provide calling party identification services.

8. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Frech** in view of **Blakely** and further in view of **Miner** (US 5,652,789).

As to Claim 3, **Frech** teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising limitations as taught in Claim 1 and the following:

Frech does not teach the following limitation:

“prompting the calling party to enter a desired directory number”

Miner teaches the limitation (Col. 7, lines 30-37). Having the cited analogous art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add prompting capability to **Frech's** invention for obtaining a calling party's telephone number as taught by **Miner's** invention in order to provide better recognition and identification of callers to subscribers.

9. Claims 5,7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Frech** in view of **Blakely** and further in view of **Bartholomew** (US 5,497,414).

As to Claim 5, **Frech** teaches the method of claim 4 further comprising the limitations as taught in Claims 1 and the following:

Frech does not teach the following limitations:

“determining if the default destination corresponds to an announcement, if so, playing the announcement and disconnecting the call”

However, it is obvious that **Frech** suggests the limitations. This is because **Frech** teaches rejecting callers (Figure 4, label 21). **Bartholomew** teaches the limitations (Figure 4A, label S124). Having the cited analogous art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the send message capability to **Frech's** invention for terminating callers as taught by **Bartholomew's** invention in order to provide calling party rejection services.

Art Unit: 2645

As to Claim 7, **Frech** teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the limitations as in Claim 1 and the following:

Frech does not teach the following limitation:

“calling directory number is blocked”

However, it is obvious that **Frech** suggests the limitations. This is because **Frech** teaches providing instructions for call treatment (Figure 3, label 30). **Bartholomew** teaches the limitations (Figure 4A, labels S122, S126). Having the cited analogous art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add blocking capability to **Frech**'s invention for terminating callers as taught by **Bartholomew**'s invention in order to provide calling party rejection services.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Frech et al. (US 5,729,592) teach calling party announcement using synthesized announcements.

11. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231
or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 306-0377 (for customer service assistance)


Art Unit: 2645

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Allan Hoosain** whose telephone number is (703) 305-4012. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Fan Tsang**, can be reached on (703) 305-4895.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


Allan Hoosain
Primary Examiner
11/24/04